

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed July 6, 2006, Applicant thanks the Examiner for his guidance and patience. Further, Applicant thanks the Examiner for his comments in the interview of December 28, 2006. All of Examiner's comments and suggestions are very much appreciated. In the present response, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 17, and 18 and canceled claims 2, 4, and 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-14 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant has amended these claims to comport with 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-14, and 17-18 as being obvious by Piretti (U.S. Patent No. 3,856,147) in view of Kent et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,288,301) and Mayr (U.S. Patent 4,253,268). However, Piretti in view of Kent and Mayr does not teach all of the elements of the amended independent claims.

In the present case, each of the independent Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 17, and 18 have incorporated the limitation of "at least one alignment stop at the end of a catch or latch to limit sliding movement of a snapped together latch and catch." Nowhere in the Piretti, Kent, or Mayr reference is there any teaching or suggestion of an alignment stop limit movement.

Therefore, because the Piretti, Kent any Mayr references when combined do not teach all the elements of newly amended Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 17, and 18, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established. As the independent claims have been amended, it is believed that Claims 5-9 and 12-14 are patentable over these references as well.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Conclusion

Applicant has complied with all requirements made in the above-referenced communication. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending Claims in the application are in condition for allowance. Allowance of the pending claims at an early date is courteously solicited.


If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's undersigned representatives, attention R. Joseph Foster at **(310) 586-6565** to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

This response is being timely filed and no fee is believed due. However, if Applicant is mistaken, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. **50-2638**. Please ensure that the Attorney Docket Number **70288-020800** is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

Date: December 28, 2006

By 
R. Joseph Foster
Reg. No. 56,953

Customer Number 33717
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (310) 586-6511
Fax: (310) 586-5511
E-mail: laipmail@gtlaw.com
LA126692521